FREEDOM

AN ANARCHIST WEEKLY

NEW SERIES, VOL. I, No. 9 | MARCH 11, 1933 | FIVE CENTS

Hunger in "Paradise"!

By JOHN A. ROBAC

The White Spot, Paradise, the Land of Eternal Sunshine that rose out of the cactus covered desert, fertilized by the sweat and bleached bones of rugged pioneer Americans, Southern California with all its tinsel trappings is tarnishing. The ravages of depression and unemployment have not spared the native favored sons and daughters. The breadlines and soup kitchens are multiplying, while the welfare industrial committees are performing clown-like capers to kid and entertain the proud descendants of those rugged individualists, the builders of this great Southland Empire. Young men and women come West and starve the same as the rest.

Here is what happened at a recent seance called by the Los Angeles charity mongers:

The chairman of the board, a colonel representing the Retail Merchants Association, and at his side a jovial, good-natured kidder of an Irishman representing the industrialists, both well groomed and well fed, remind the motley gathering of a thousand representatives of labor and workers that they have no ulterior motive or anything to gain in calling this hearing. The reason that they have gathered here tonight was to again rededicate the great democratic principle of our paternalistic Republic and ascertain on how much of a minimum wage can an independent, self-respecting and self-supporting American live, nay starve! The minimum wage law for women in industry in California is a dead-letter law. Even the dull and slow-witted A. F. of L. representatives were quick to discover that the hearing sprung so suddenly upon unsuspecting starving workers and starving women in Scab Town Paradise seemed fishy.

The self-complacency of the "Little Fathers of the State" was somewhat disturbed by a few women workers. Mathilda Robbins was the only social service worker who dared to point out the futility of discussing the cost of living without taking into consideration that the prevailing rate of wages for women in industry is at present far below the so-called minimum wage law. Speaking for the many thousands of poor working women, she also mentioned the fact that many self-respecting, independent American women had to take a pauper's oath to be entitled to receive help from the organized charity institutions. A pathetic note was struck by her when she called to the attention of the welfare commission that she had the pay envelopes of a woman whose average wage per week was only $1.50. Then why talk about the cost of living?

Rose Pesotta, representing the International Ladies' Garment Workers, pointed out clearly that the industry is demoralized as a result of a free-for-all, and the lash of unemployment only helps the employers to become more ruthless and arrogant to women workers, especially where there is no strong organization. She stressed the fact that the minimum wage for women has become the maximum wage for men in skilled industry, that this hearing is but an empty gesture and also an excuse to justify a further nullification of the so-called minimum wage of living, when they are not living but just gradu- law. Others asked how can they talk about the cost ally starving like the proverbial farmer's mule.

Make the Revolution Now!

By HARRY KELLY

We have information from reliable—even if only liberal—sources that Mr. Roosevelt is sincere and earnest in his desire to do something to alleviate the present chaotic condition. If words meant deeds what a wonderful thing it would be! Unfortunately they do not, and because of that we read the words of Mr. Roosevelt with admiration for his scholarship but with a skepticism bordering on cynicism as to the "new deal." He is neither a superman or a miracle worker, and the evils of this acquisitive society need far more drastic action than this smiling and seemingly good-natured man can give.

Not one individual out of ten thousand and possibly not one of one hundred thousand knows or understands the mechanics of banking and we do not pretend to be one of the elect. We do know, however, that of all the parasites in society the bankers are by far the most powerful and that they really dominate the rest of us through cornering the medium of exchange. With forty-two billions in deposits and only nine billion of actual money, of which only four billion is in gold, it is the most arrant humbug to pretend that every depositor can demand gold and get it when he presents his check at the bank. This is one of those social myths Sorel must have had in mind. Every person who puts his money in a savings bank expects to get something for it, overlooking the plain fact that to get interest from the banker he must in return lend the money out to someone at a higher rate. In other words how can even the most honest banker give the depositor something for nothing without getting it from someone else—and that of course involves a risk? Get something for nothing; if you have two spades, such as Bolton Hall talks about, lend one out to another fellow and charge him for it, and if you can make enough spades to lend out you can sit back and look at the suckers work while you loaf. It is all very well to say you want what you produce, but whether we like it or not it leads inevitably to a cut-throat policy such as we have now.

How We Are Robbed

In a mechanized society such as ours wherein men are simple cogs in a vast machine the exchange of products becomes a highly specialized and complicated matter and the specialists soon become so adept at their job they learn how to corner the medium and charge for its use. The worker in a Ford factory punching one single hole in a machine demands what he produces and then, to determine what that is, an intricate system is developed that soon enmeshes him in its coils and he is paying most of what he produces to the man who controls the medium of exchange. Farmers get forty cents a bushel for wheat and the city worker pays ten times that amount by the time it reaches him in the shape of bread. The city worker on the other hand receives ten or twelve cents for a pair of overalls and by the time it reaches the farmer the latter pays probably ten times the price, with the result he wears a pair for an average of seven years. (Recent surveys by the Emergency Exchange of New York looking to the possibility of barter between farmer and city worker showed that the average farmer wears a pair of overalls seven years.) Both workers are hungry and ill clad, and those who deprive themselves of many of the joys of life and too often some of the necessities to protect themselves in their old age place their savings in the hands of these smooth silk-hatted bandits and find themselves far too often penniless and on the breadlines. The bankers on the other hand through their control of the medium of exchange live in lazy luxury and dominate the world. And the remedy, oh yes, the remedy?

Bankers Are Parasites

The first thing to do is to awaken the people to the fact that bankers are a part of capitalism and with the abolition of the latter the former will of necessity disappear. They produce nothing and add nothing to the sum total of wealth of the community and just why they should be rewarded in excess of the real producer it would be hard to explain, let alone justify, except on the ground that what is is right. Roosevelt is all het up over "speculating with other people's money," and he would have us believe that with the resignation of Messrs. Mitchell and Baker from the National City Bank directorate their successors will act differently and everything will be O. K. Those same directors knew and acquiesced in the actions of those gentlemen and profited by those acts and the leopard remains a leopard even if you change his name. Presidents of banks, insurance, steel, railroad and other corporations are not only tolerated but extolled no matter how infamous if only they can make money for their stockholders and not be found out. Mitchell and Baker were found out so their usefulness was at an end. Bankers are no more useful than tailors, shoemakers or farmers and entitled to no greater remuneration, even under capitalism, but under capitalism the highest rewards go to the man or men best able to fool and swindle the people, and as the banker has succeeded in creating a machine which is the very life blood of modern commercialism that no one understands but himself, all he has to do is persuade the people the safety of the country depends on him and everything is settled.

Organize Now!

Perhaps capitalism is breaking down and with millions of men and women out of work and many of them living on less than a dollar a week, while there is a surplus of hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and other necessaries of life, with farmers in rags, men and women are in a mood to listen to new ideas if intelligently presented. Suppose we assume the revolution is actually here and try to organize production and distribution here and now. In New York City for instance there are roughly speaking, one million unemployed men and women representing every kind of trade and occupation. Why can not a works council be organized with the available labor classified in trades and callings? Then let a survey of idle plants with their equipment be made and one does not have to be over sanguine

(*Continued on page* 2)

FREEDOM

Successor to ROAD TO FREEDOM

NEW SERIES, VOL. I, No. 9

A Weekly Journal of Anarchist News and Opinion

Published Weekly by

Road to Freedom Publishing Ass'n

219 Second Avenue, New York, N. Y.

EDITORS

L. RAYMOND HARRY KELLY

M. JAGENDORF

Application for second class matter pending

* * *

Single copies Five Cents; $2.00 a year

Book Review

By AMMON A. HENNACY

"The Epic of America," by James Truslow Adams.

This is the best all-around book dealing with American history that has yet appeared. Gustavus Myers has told in three large volumes of the essential crookedness of men of wealth; A. M. Simons in his "Social Forces in American History" gave a clear account which has been somewhat dimmed by his pro-war and pro-capitalistic attitude; James O'Neal has been so busy defending second-rate Socialist politicians that he has not had the time to elaborate on his first book; the works of Prof. J. Allen Smith and Charles A. Beard are of course classics in their interpretation of the making of the Constitution.

In a book that does not accept the radical thesis, but is fairminded on this subject, the simple statement that "Gov. Altgeld . . . was greatly disliked by capital because of legislation which he had secured and because he had pardoned certain men involved in the Haymarket bomb affair in 1886, *though it is now known that they were innocent,"* is a vindication by an historically minded man of the Haymarket martyrs.

Mr. Adams realized that the whole reform movement was a fight between the small and the large capitalist and states that: "I have little trust in the wise paternalism of politicians or the infinite wisdom of business leaders. . . . Under our political system it is useless save by the rarest of happy accidents, to expect a politician to rise higher than the source of his power. . . . Just so long as wealth and power are our sole badges of success, so long will ambitious men strive to attain them." Here we have a recognition of the Anarchist principle of not depending upon politicians for progress. As Lincoln Steffens said in his recent autobiography, it is foolish to hold the prize of special privilege for the greedy and then not expect greedy men to take advantage of anyone.

Around 1890, with the passing of the frontier, the ordinary citizen did not care very much about the big grafter if he were only able to continue his small graft. Mr. Adams points out also that men could not escape a solution of problems by moving West. Speaking of Coolidge, Hoover and Mellon, he says that they surrendered idealism for the sake of prosperity and did not get prosperity. These " 'practical' men bankrupted us on both of them (idealism and prosperity). It is impractical to be only 'practical.' Without vision the people perish."

History since the War was given a classic expression by Mr. Adams: "Harding had to liquidate the war; Coolidge had to quietly liquidate the scandals of the Harding regime; and Hoover is now watching the liquidation of 'Coolidge prosperity.' "

We have here an historian who shows that it was the upper class who was against the Revolutionary War, but when it seemed that victory was with the colonists this same class cheated and disfranchised those who had done the actual fighting of the Revolution. He gives several sly digs at the D.A.R.

The average American history devotes hundreds of pages to the question of slavery and the battles of the Civil War. Mr. Adams connects the conflict of states rights and the treason of his native New England during the War of 1812, with the problem of the Civil War and ventures the thought that more of us would probably feel a more satisfactory answer to this problem if the South had been allowed to secede. He says that the slave owner could not turn off his slaves in bad times like the Northern manufacturer. The problem of wage vs. chattel slavery is well stated:

"The Southerner exploited labor in the shape of legal slavery, the Northerner in the shape of wage slavery. Neither was conscious of any moral guilt in adapting himself to the social structure that had been shaped by the economic situation of his own section. . . . To have these Yankees who drove their wage slaves twelve to fourteen hours a day in badly ventilated mills for a few cents pay, and who never assumed the slightest responsibility for them when sick, old, or out of work, tell the Southerner that his form of slavery was immoral, and thus assume airs of superiority, was galling. . . . To him it was an outcropping again of the inevitable persecuting mania of the Puritan—a sequel to the Salem witches, the banishments and hangings of Massachusetts history."

Mr. Adams frankly admits that the stories of German atrocities were faked, and while he partly justifies the entry of the United States in the war he has no illusion as to the evil effects of this decision.

Jefferson had declared that his democratic ideas would only work out as the country was composed of freemen and freeholders. Hamilton's aristocrats had pauperized the people, and the value of education upon which so many leaders had depended had failed because our educational system had no values except that of money. The extent to which the compromise in the Constitution over slavery had led us to further compromises is shown: "If the slaves were to do as the masters told them because *they* had the power, and the South were to do as the North said because *it* had the power, why should not the little citizen do as the big citizens and the capitalists said because *they* had the power?"

Make the Revolution Now!

(*Continued from page* 1)

to believe that many of the owners of small plants would be only too willing to join hands with such a council. When this is done and the council knows what can be done, delegates could visit farmers in and around the city with a proposal to exchange products, giving them data as to manufactured goods that can be delivered and asking the farmers what they can and would exchange in return. Difficulties there are, but to wait for some miracle or superman to start a revolution is as childish as it is hopeless. Make the revolution now with new and constructive ideas and acts instead of waiting for catastrophes and supermen to do it. For more than three years people have been waiting for prosperity to bump into them instead of going around the corner and meeting it or making it. The Anarchist says that not only he who would be free himself must strike the blow but insists that nothing, positively nothing of a constructive nature comes by itself or of itself. Capitalism may break down of its own weight, and it looks as if it will, but what of it if men lack ideas and initiative in coping with the situation? Must we adopt the fatalistic ideas of those who believe that God is in heaven and all is right with the world? A free society based upon the principle of each according to his ability and each according to his needs is in our opinion the only society worth striving for, but we hate poverty and misery with all our being and can find no satisfaction in wanting people to be miserable in the hope they will be forced to revolt. Men become debilitated from lack of food, from cold and hardships until they lose all sense of independence and love of liberty, and kiss the hand that feeds them only to further exploit them. In their desperation such men may help bring down the capitalist system but rebuilding it is a task beyond their power or ability. Never in the long struggle for freedom in this country has the time been so ripe as now for a close relation between farmer and city worker and a heavy responsibility rests upon those claiming to want a change. The farmer through his barter exchanges and the intimidation of those seeking to drive him from his home has done things far beyond anything the city worker has yet shown himself willing to do. He has shown a sense of reality and a grasp of things that should make the city worker with his air of superiority, even if they do not, feel very humble.

Will something be done or will we continue to be "intoxicated by the exuberance of our own verbosity," as Disraeli said of Gladstone? Shall we demonstrate our ability to do more than merely talk? The time is ripe and rotten ripe for a constructive program that will bear the stamp of realism. Will we act or will we continue to be visionaries without the will to really do anything in the present crisis?

* * *

Michigan Notes

By CARL NOLD

It is a good thing for the capitalist papers always to have a scapegoat and a bugaboo handy to scare the workers. Fifty years ago it was the Knights of Labor, forty years ago the A. F. of L., thirty years ago the Anarchists, twenty years ago the Socialists, ten years ago the I.W.W. Now it is the Communists who are blamed for everything, for the American workingman still believes in ghosts.

A few thousand automobile-bodymakers in Detroit went on strike because wages had been cut so low that it was immaterial to them whether they worked in a factory or were supported by the city. The bosses charged that their men had been misled by Communists, and the daily papers took up the cry. The body-workers, to prove their 100-per-cent loyalty, called a meeting and ousted a few Communists. Then they addressed an open letter to the bosses, saying: "You see what good boys we are! We have fired the Communists, now you can deal with us as loyal, sovereign, 100-per-cent American citizens."

The bosses, who in the meantime had hired enough scabs to do the work, smiled and made no answer.

* * *

"Lansing, Mich., Feb. 10—In the presence of a number of press correspondents, Gov. Comstock at 5:05 p. m. Thursday signed the first bill passed by the 1933 Legislature.

"It provided that the bills to be considered this session shall be printed on cheaper paper than has heretofore been used."

Ain't it hell, how we're saving? I bet a nickel's worth of peanuts against a hot dog that this piece of legislation costs the state more to enact than will be saved by its operation.

Why a Government?

By DR. MICHAEL A. COHN

"One of Mr. Roosevelt's most trying problems is the choice of a cabinet. But why have a cabinet? 'We have no foreign policy,' says the New York *Times*, so why have a Secretary of State? The Treasury is empty—so why bother with a Secretary of the Treasury? The army could be disbanded and the navy sunk, to the great advantage of everybody concerned—so why not go ahead and thus dispense with these two officials? There is no labor in the country any more, only unemployment — so the Secretary of Labor can just as well be laid off. Commerce is dead—and the Secretary of Commerce can therefore be dismissed. Agriculture is prostrate—so the Secretary of Agriculture is a quite unnecessary luxury. The Post Office has got to run, at least for a little while longer; but the Postmaster-General is never anything more than a political advisor, so why not make political advice a private commodity, and leave the First Assistant Postmaster-General to run the office, as per usual? The Attorney-General would seem to be a fixture, but could justice be in any lower estate in this country if this official were not appointed? This leaves only the Secretary of the Interior, a kind of man-of-all-work, who might well be retained, perhaps, as the President's valet, chauffeur, and bodyguard. The more we think of this idea of dropping the cabinet, the better we like it. The relief to the President would be incalculable. The saving in terms of economy would be colossal, for not only would salaries be wiped out, but all the cost of secretaries, telephones, automobiles, stationery, and cigars."

An Anarchist Argument

I must beg the reader's indulgence for this long quotation, but it was impossible for me to resist the temptation of this Anarchistic argument taken from the first page of *Unity*, a weekly published in Chicago for the last one hundred and ten years and now under the editorship of my friend, John Haynes Holmes, head of the Community Church in the City of New York.

Little did Mr. Holmes know that his words will be quoted by a pronounced Anarchist in an Anarchist paper. Naturally, Mr. Holmes intended it as a joke or a satire, but I am taking him seriously. I presume he would be shocked to learn that the logical conclusion of his splendid reasoning must inevitably and unmercifully be a society with *no government*. Which, by the way, must also be the necessary conclusion reached from the well-known stand taken by Thomas Jefferson at the end of the Eighteenth Century when he said "that government is best which governs least."

Mr. Holmes, of whom I stand in great esteem and admiration, is an ultra-governmentalist. He thinks Anarchism is a lot of nonsense. He is a staunch supporter of Prohibition—almost a fanatic on that subject. He thinks that law and punishment are a panacea for all wrongs and evils of society.

Paradoxically, he is a pronounced man of peace. Gandhi has no greater admirer than John Haynes Holmes. Both stand firmly and emphatically against all sorts of force and violence. I would not say that they belong to the non-resistants, but they certainly do not go beyond passive resistance. In his splendid book, "Is Violence The Way Out?", he brings all the forcefulness of logic and humanitarianism to bear upon this thesis, reaching the conclusion that violence is not the way out and never was.

Mr. Holmes and I have broken many a lance on this subject of governmentalism vs. Anarchism. I was, therefore, not a little surprised when I read the above editorial in his paper. It seems to me that he inadvertently played into my hands.

I am sure that Mr. Holmes upon reading these lines might be tempted to express himself on this subject in the columns of FREEDOM. You and I would like nothing better. We cannot afford to be less tolerant in our organ than he is in his. The fact is that I personally know of no one more broad-minded and a greater lover of fair play than is John Haynes Holmes.

State Based on Violence

The last thing I desire is to put him in any sort of a predicament. It is mighty difficult to achieve that anyway. But what I would like to know is how can he reconcile his utterances in the above quotation with centralized government, and also can he quote any illustration in the history of society from the beginning of time of a State or government that ever existed without force and violence?

I am afraid that men like Holmes very often confuse the idea of government with that of administration. These conceptions are not only not identical but, on the contrary, they are contradictory terms. Government invariably spells mal-administration. We believe in a system of production, distribution, transport and communication run by expert engineers, statisticians and administrators.

It, therefore, seems to me that he is not consistent on this point. Government means force and violence; it means armies and navies; war, civil and internecine; it means man-made laws and punishment for the transgression of those laws, be it a mere fine, or imprisonment, exile, deportation, and even the penalty of death by hanging, the guillotine or the electric chair. One can't even have his choice—except in Utah and Nevada.

I could never understand why it is impossible for men of intelligence and erudition to conceive of a state of society where folks can live together without private ownership of the means of production and without an organized government

Government is Doomed

Personally, I was never more convinced in all my life than I am today that society is rapidly reaching the stage when the institution known as government will have entirely vanished or dwindled to the least possible minimum.

Why cannot sensible men and women live together in peace and harmony, morally, ethically, without the fear of the policeman's club or the hangman's scaffold? Why cannot all work be done voluntarily in a co-operative commonwealth?

Surely, the Malthusian or Neo-Malthusian theory as regards the insufficiency of production for the supply of the whole human race is by now totally exploded. We know, as well as do the Technocrats, that with the help of modern machinery we can supply all the comforts and even luxuries to everybody with a maximum of two hours daily work. Peter Kropotkin beat Scott, Douglas, Orage, Benton et al, to it by a a score of years and more.

Yes, Mr. Holmes is right. We can very well do without not only all the cabinet ministers in Washington, but without Congress, and the President, and the army and navy, and all the hundreds of thousands of bureaucrats who rule this and every other country. They are not our servants, but our rulers and masters, the same as is Mussolini in Italy, Stalin in Russia, Hitler in Germany, Pilsudsky in Poland and Horthy in Hungary.

FREEDOM SPRING COSTUME BALL

FRIDAY, APRIL 7TH

Irving Plaza Hall

15th Street and Irving Place, New York City

Tickets 50 cents

A Letter

Some Suggestions

New York, N. Y., Feb. 13, 1933

I have read all of the five issues of FREEDOM and under the circumstances find it very good. However, with the aid of our comrades and sympathizers, the paper can be much improved, realizing of course that there is always room for improvement in the best of publications.

On the whole the reading material is good. It helps to enlighten our readers on the most important questions of the day, but it does not, however, voice strongly enough the ideals for which it was originally intended.

I would suggest that a series of articles be published in your future issues pertaining to the following topics:

(a) "What is Anarchism?"

There are thousands of workers who are still imbued with the idea that Anarchism is a theory created by Satan himself and stands for chaos and destruction. They even picture an Anarchist with a bomb in one hand and a knife in the other, ready to assassinate kings, presidents and great captains of industry. It is really not their fault, but to a great extent it is ours.

The majority of the Anarchistic publications have printed material of every description (which is of course essential), but have neglected to give, in simple language, a real and vivid explanation of the theory of Anarchism and what it stands for.

(b) "What is Communism?"

The majority of the working class today think that Russia is practising real Communism, but is it?

(c) "Why are we Anarchists?"

(d) "How can Anarchist-Communism solve the economic problems that capitalism and even Socialism are unable to solve?"

I would also suggest that you print a proletarian poem in every issue. There are many to be found in the works of those two famous Jewish poets, Edelstadt and Bovshaver.

E. M. Kammin

LUNCHEON

for the benefit of

FREEDOM

Saturday, March 18th, 5 P. M.

at

219 Second Avenue, New York City

All Comrades Welcome

A report of the Anarchist Propaganda Conference held in New York February 18th will appear in FREEDOM next week.

* * *

A dinner will be served Sunday evening, March 12th, at 6:30 o'clock at 227 East 12th Street, for the benefit of the International Center. Tickets 50¢.

Co-operation and Mutual Service

By CHARLES T. SPRADING

(Continued from last week)

Wherever a government controls everything as in Russia, it is slavery for the people, while co-operation is freedom for the people to own and control what they produce. This is why the believers in the right of the producers to the product were staunch advocates of co-operation.

Co-operators uphold all the rights of man that the Bolsheviks abrogate. The co-operator believes in the right of the producer to his product. He believes in the right of property obtained by free contract, or exchange of service or goods. And he does not believe in obtaining property by force or fraud.

Co-operation needs no army and navy to uphold its sway, as do Bolshevism and capitalism. Denmark has abolished its army and navy just because it is a co-operative country. It is richer per capita than any other country in Europe, but it is in no danger of invasion, while all the capitalist nations and the Bolshevik one expect a war at any time. Dishonesty breeds bloodshed.

Co-operation is Voluntary

As co-operation is voluntary association, it is the opposite of compulsory organizations, like government. All must belong to and support government whether they like it or not. But co-operation is like a fraternal organization; one can belong or not, as he chooses. This shows the difference between a State Communism where all must belong, and a co-operative society where the smallest possible individualistic minority could be perfectly independent of any co-operative compulsion or domination.

The right of co-operation is not founded on might, but on equity. It does not require a majority, as does politics, to establish it. A few people have made great success in co-operation, as the Rochdale case clearly shows, and as thousands of other cases prove in many lands, without the aid of politics or government.

Co-operation is not a political plan. It is an economic plan. It is an established fact of eighty-eight years' standing and has spread into fifty-one countries of the world.

Futility of Politics

Governments established by force are frequently overthrown by force. Where controlled by political parties, they are often changed when parties lose power. Governments change hands frequently in some countries like England and France. Two or three times a year is not uncommon. Now just suppose the co-operatives in England backed a political party and government. When the latter is discredited by being outvoted in Parliament it resigns. Then where is co-operation? In the scrap-heap, because it was part of discredited government.

Co-operators hold that economic questions should be solved by economic means. Scientists do not solve astronomical problems by appealing to biology. Chemists do not appeal to geology to settle their problems, but half-educated economists appeal to politics or to militarism to solve economic problems.

For ages the military class has "settled" economic matters, and it is still at it, but what economic problems has it settled correctly or justly? The politicians have been even more busy than the militarists settling economic questions, and are still at it tooth and claw, but what have they settled? What economic problem has been laid away or completed? All honest thinkers must admit that they have solved nothing of a vital nature in the economic field.

Politicians are never discouraged by failures, however. They stand ready to do it again with slight variations. They never surrender their theory that all problems can be solved by law. If the law they passed doesn't do it, they can think of one that will. The fact that we have over two million laws now on our statute books gives them no pause.

Laws Solve Nothing

If laws would solve economic problems, we should have no problems left to solve, with all our laws covering every phase of the subject. The politicians could aid some in the economic solution by repealing a million or so of the laws, so that the people would have a clear field in which to operate the real solution, for many laws now operative hamper proper methods being used.

This explains why wise co-operators oppose political action by co-operatives. Politics means domination by the majority, and that isn't voluntary. Believers in liberty do not want it determined by votes. It might be outvoted. The justice and success of co-operatives must not depend on votes. They are not political, but economic. Economic laws are not determined by vote, and they should not be submitted to it.

Some co-operators have made the mistake of going into politics as co-operators. They thought to strengthen the co-operatives by political endorsements, believing that if they became the dominant party and captured the government, they could force co-operation on the country. This was the case in Italy. The co-operatives endorsed the Socialist party, and when Mussolini became dictator he stamped out the Socialist party and also the co-operatives. He could not distinguish between them, and the co-operatives paid with their lives for their mistake.

In Mexico the co-operatives are in a bad way for the very same reason. They tangled themselves in the political fight and when their side lost, down went the co-operatives, because they had abandoned the correct voluntary method, and had resorted to force through numbers of votes and, not having enough power, they were defeated by those who had.

The method of political fixing of an economic situation is right now before the people of our country, and its failure is so complete that even the dullest ones admit it.

"Farm Relief"

In June, 1929, Congress passed the Farm Relief Law. It provided for a Federal Farm Board with wide authority and ample funds to enable agriculture to attain an equal opportunity in our economic system with other industries.

The Federal Farm Board was appointed by President Hoover. Alexander W. Legge was made chairman of the Board. Congress appropriated $500,000,000 as a revolving fund to be used to mitigate the farmers' problems.

The Federal Farm Board plunged at once into speculation and price fixing. It brought up hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat at around one dollar to stabilize the price, and the effect was that the price sank to around half what the Board paid for it, and the price now is about fifty cents a bushel. About the same thing occurred in cotton and other commodities. The Board attempted to stabilize by investments and price fixing through governmental authority.

The Board seemed totally ignorant of the many failures of political price fixing. History is replete with the many failures of government price fixing. Buying wheat and trying to fix prices have been attempted unsuccessfully many times by individuals also. Joseph Leiter, of Chicago, went broke trying that, thirty odd years ago.

Critics have heaped ridicule and condemnation on Mr. Legge for his action, and some have charged that his investment in wheat was a life-saver for the International Harvester Company; that the farmers owed that company hundreds of millions of dollars for farmers' implements that they could not pay until Mr. Legge bought their wheat. Mr. Legge was at the head of the International Harvester Company, and was just loaned to the Farm Board, and has resigned, and is now back with his company.

Of course the farmers should not be contented with co-operative marketing, as beneficial as that is. They should organize into a complete co-operation.

Co-operation has been accomplished in many countries, and by millions of people. It is no longer a theory, but a practical fact of economics. When this system becomes general, it will mean the regeneration of society. For when everything is sold at cost price, that is, the price which exactly represents the sum of wealth and labor which it has absorbed, the dream of the great idealists of justice in economic relations will have been reached, and mankind will have been transformed into real human beings.

Lectures Under Auspices of the
LIBERTARIAN GROUP
Of New York (Anarchist)
Meets at
International Centre, 227 East 12th Street
Near 2nd Avenue
EVERY WEDNESDAY AT 8:30 P.M.

March 15th
A. M. DEUTSCH
"What Science Knows of the Future Life"

March 22nd
M. SCHMIDT
"The Future of Libertarian Struggle"

March 29th
L. SECO
Secretary of Kentucky Miners' Defense Committee
"The I.W.W. and the World Crisis"

Open Forum, Questions and Discussions
Invite Your Friends—Admission Free!

MARCH 18TH
Commune Celebration and Dance—25 Cents

LOS ANGELES, AT 8:30
Libertarian Forum, 420 N. Soto St., Mondays;
Confederate Libertarian Forum, 224 South Spring. Thursdays
Russian Progressive Club, 1785 East First Street. Open evenings.

DETROIT EDUCATIONAL FORUM
at the LIBERTARIAN CENTER
2105 Third Street, Corner Elizabeth Street
LECTURES EVERY SUNDAY, 7:30 P.M.

FREE SOCIETY FORUM
1241 N. California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Lectures and Discussions Every Sunday, 8 P.M.

An April Fool package party and dance for the benefit of FREEDOM will be held Saturday evening, April 1st, at the Progressive Russian Club, 1785 East First Street, Los Angeles, under the auspices of Libertarian Group, Kropotkin Literary Society W. C. Br. 413 and Kropotkin Literary Society W. C. Br. 413 B. All comrades are asked to come, bring packages and participate in the fun.